

## Degree Program Student Learning Report (rev. 7/14)

Fall 2014 – Spring 2015

The Department of Applied Technology in the School of Business & Technology

# Applied Technology, A.A.S.

Effectively assessing a degree program should address a number of factors:

- 1) Valid student learning outcomes should be clearly articulated;
- 2) Valid assessment measures should be used, consistent with the standards of professional practice;
- 3) There should be evidence that assessment data are being used by faculty to make necessary instructional or assessment changes; and there should be evidence that instructional or assessment changes are being implemented to improve student learning.

### PART 1 (A & B)

#### Relationship of Degree Program Learning Outcomes to Departmental and University Missions

**A.** Clearly state the school, department and degree program missions.

| University Mission  | School Mission  | Department Mission  | Degree Program Mission  |
|---|---|---|---|
| Our mission is to ensure students develop the skills and knowledge required to achieve professional and personal goals in dynamic local and global communities. | The mission of the School of Business and Technology is to prepare students to compete and perform successfully in diverse careers in business, technology, sport management, and related fields by providing a quality | The mission of the Department of Applied Technology is to support the School of Business and Technology and RSU in their mission to prepare students to achieve professional and personal goals in dynamic local and global | To provide students with a quality education in a technology area by emphasizing a combination of general education courses and a selection of courses in a technical specialty. The program develops a knowledge base through core |

| University Mission | School Mission   | Department Mission   | Degree Program Mission   |
|--------------------|--|--|--|
|                    | academic experience. Undergraduate programs and their respective curricula will remain responsive to social, economic, and technical developments. | communities. Specifically, the organizational structure of the Department of Technology provides the technology course support for the Associate in Science and Associate in Applied Science degrees, as well as the Bachelor of Science in Business Information Technology, the Bachelor of Science in Game Development, and the Bachelor of Technology in Applied Technology. As indicated, many of the programs offered by the Department of Applied Technology are available online. | courses and selected electives while advancing a general view of technology. |

- B.** Clearly state school purposes, department purposes and degree program student learning outcomes. Align student learning outcomes with their appropriate school and department purposes, and these outcomes and purposes with their appropriate university commitments.

| University Commitments  | School Purposes   | Department Purposes   | Student Learning Outcomes   |
|---|---|---|---|
| To provide quality associate, baccalaureate, and graduate degree opportunities and educational experiences which foster student excellence in oral and written communications, scientific reasoning and critical and creative thinking. | The SBT provides this support by offering two-year and four-year educational opportunities in business, sport management, and technology. | To provide the technology course support for the AS in Computer Science and AAS in Applied Technology degrees as well as BS in Business Information Technology, BS in Game Development, and BT in Applied Technology. | <p>1. Students will demonstrate proficiency in the use of currently standard computing tools such as internet browsers, email, word processors, spreadsheets, database management tools, and presentation software.</p> <p>2. Students will demonstrate knowledge in the field of microeconomics.</p> |

| University Commitments   | School Purposes | Department Purposes | Student Learning Outcomes  |
|--|-----------------|---------------------|--|
|  |                 |                     | <p>3. Students will demonstrate a basic knowledge in the field of financial Accounting.</p> <p>4. Students will demonstrate an understanding of management principles.</p> |
| To promote an atmosphere of academic and intellectual freedom and respect for diverse expression in an environment of physical safety that is supportive of teaching and learning. |                 |                     |  |
| To provide a general liberal arts education that supports specialized academic program sand prepares students for lifelong learning and service in a diverse society.              |                 |                     |  |
| To provide students with a diverse, innovative faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarly pursuits and continuous improvement of programs.                             |                 |                     |  |
| To provide university-wide student services, activities and resources that complement academic programs.   |                 |                     |  |
| To support and strengthen student, faculty and administrative structures that promote shared governance of the institution.  |                 |                     |  |
| To promote and encourage student, faculty, staff and community interaction in a positive academic climate that creates   |                 |                     |  |

| University Commitments   | School Purposes | Department Purposes | Student Learning Outcomes |
|--|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| opportunities for cultural, intellectual and personal enrichment for the University and the communities it serves. |                 |                     |                           |

## PART 2

### Discussion of Instructional Changes Resulting from 2013-2014 Degree Program Student Learning Report

List and discuss all instructional or assessment changes proposed in Part 5 of last year's Degree Program Student Learning Report, whether implemented or not. Any other changes or assessment activities from last year, but not mentioned in last year's report, should be discussed here as well. Emphasis should be placed on student learning and considerations such as course improvements, the assessment process, and the budget. If no changes were planned or implemented, simply state "No changes were planned or implemented."

| Instructional or Assessment Changes  | Changes Implemented (Y/N) | Impact of Changes on Degree Program Curriculum or Budget |
|--|---------------------------|--|
| No changes. However, the Business Department stopped using pre-test/post-test for assessment in their courses. The only pre-test/post-test data available in 2014-2015 is that of Principles of Marketing MKTG 3113. Hence, we do not have data for SLO 2, 3, 4. | N                         | None.  |

### PART 3

#### Discussion About the University Assessment Committee's 2013-2014 Peer Review Report

The University Assessment Committee in its Degree Program Peer Review Report provided feedback and recommendations for improvement in assessment. List or accurately summarize all feedback and recommendations from the committee, and state whether they were implemented or will be implemented at a future date. If they were not or will not be implemented, please explain why. If no changes were recommended last year, simply state "No changes were recommended."

Review: Trend data should be displayed when they're available. Whereas this cannot be done in every case, there are examples of historical data (e.g., BTAT exit exam) which could have been displayed. Also, it would be helpful to see data aggregated into common categories, such as standard percentage ranges, rather than reporting raw data.

In the Weaknesses section of the 2013-2014 Peer Review Report, the committee suggested including trend and historical data and aggregated data into common categories such as percentage range rather than reporting raw data. In the case of SLO 1, we do have the aggregated data broken down to percentage categories. We now included last year's overall result in the conclusion for comparison. A trend analysis is not useful in this case since this SLO essentially measures the students' performance for meeting the RSU Computer Proficiency requirement. We feel a year to year comparison is sufficient to detect any abnormality in the data and to take corrective actions if needed.

Review: The peer review team recommends that steps be taken so that data needed by Applied Technology be made available in order to improve their assessment value.

Meaningful assessment tools for SLO's for this program are rather difficult to come up with. This program consists of 19 hours of general education courses, 30 hours of technical specialty and 12 hours of core requirement. Since each student has different course mix in his or her technical specialty and only one course CS 1113 Microcomputer Applications in the core is from our department, we have been relying on the Business Department to supply us assessment data for the remaining three courses in the core: ECON 2123 Principles of Microeconomics, ACCT 2103 Accounting I and MGMT 3013 Principles of management. However, the faculty in those business classes no longer conduct pretest/post-test assessment. The Business Department no longer uses pre-test/post-test in their assessment reports. We are discussing a proposal to create an AASAT assessment exam to be given to all graduating students similar to BIT and BTAT exit exams we give to the students in their respective capstone courses. The exam will consist of questions supplied by the faculty members who teach in those four core courses and it will be online and will be taken when the student has completed all core courses. The logistics of designing and implementing this exam will be further discussed at departmental meetings.

## PART 4

### Analysis of Evidence of Student Learning Outcomes

For all student learning outcomes (as listed in Part 1 B above), describe the assessment measures and performance standards used, as well as the sampling methods and sample sizes. For each measure, document the results of the activity measured and draw relevant conclusions related to strengths and weaknesses of their performance.

| A.<br>Student Learning Outcomes  | B.<br>Assessment Measures   | C.<br>Performance Standards  | D.<br>Sampling Methods   | E.<br>Sample Size (N) | F.<br>Results   | G.<br>Conclusions   | H.<br>Performance Standards Met (Y/N) |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Students will demonstrate proficiency in the use of currently standard computing tools such as internet browsers, email, word processors, spreadsheets, database management tools, and presentation software. | A standardized final exam developed by the MASH (Microcomputer Applications Stakeholders) to assess the skill level of Microsoft Office 2012. | At least seventy percent of the AAS AT majors enrolled in CS 1113 Microcomputer Applications will successfully complete CS 1113 Microcomputer Applications with a score of 78% or better on the standardized final exam. | All AASAT majors who took the Microcomputer Applications course in the fall 2014 and the spring 2015 | 22                    | <p>The breakdown of the number of students for each category (A – F), for the in-class, online, and blended classes final test scores follows:<br/> Twenty in-class students:<br/> 7 A's (90-100%)<br/> 7 B's (80-89%):<br/> 5 C's (70-79%)<br/> 1 D's (60-69%)<br/> 0 F's (Below 60%)</p> <p>Two online class students<br/> 2 A's (90-100%)<br/> 0 B (80-89%): 1<br/> 0 C's (70-79%)<br/> 0 D (60-69%)<br/> 0 F's (Below 60%).<br/> One-hundred percent scored 78% or higher on the final.</p> <p>No blended class students</p> <p>Overall: In-class + online students<br/> Seventeen out of twenty-two students 77% scored 78% or higher on the final, satisfying the computer proficiency requirement.</p> | <p>Students demonstrated proficiency in the use of email, Internet, word processing, spreadsheet, and presentation software.</p> <p>The comparative data between this year and last year for students meeting the computer proficiency requirement:</p> <p>2013-2014<br/> 80% (12 out of 15 students) met.</p> <p>2014-2015<br/> 77% (17 out of 22 students) met.</p> <p>There was a slight drop in percentage this year, but it is insignificant since the sample size is small.</p> | Y                                     |

| A.<br>Student Learning Outcomes  | B.<br>Assessment Measures  | C.<br>Performance Standards  | D.<br>Sampling Methods         | E.<br>Sample Size (N) | F.<br>Results | G.<br>Conclusions   | H.<br>Performance Standards Met (Y/N) |
|--|--|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| 2. Students will demonstrate knowledge in the field of economics                     | A pre-test and post-test will be administered in ECON 2123 Principles of Microeconomics. | Students will improve posttest scores over pretest scores by at least 20% in ECON 2123 Principles of Micro Economics.                | All students taking ECON 2123  |                       |               | No data were available. The pre-test and post-test were not conducted in ECON 2123 classes. | NA                                    |
| 3. Students will demonstrate a basic knowledge in the field of financial accounting. | A pre-test and post-test will be administered in ACCT 2103 Accounting I- Financial.      | Students will improve posttest scores over pretest scores by at least 20% in ACCT 2103 Accounting I – Financial                      | All students taking ACCT 2103  |                       |               | No data were available. The pre-test and post-test were not conducted in ACCT 2103 classes. | NA                                    |
| 4. Students will demonstrate an understanding of management principles               | A pre-test and post-test will be given in MGMT 3013.                                     | 70% of students will improve post-test scores over pre-test scores by at least 20% or will score at least 80% level on the pre-test. | All students taking MGMT 3013. | 85                    |               | Pre-test and post-test were not conducted in MGMT 3013 classes.                             | NA                                    |

## PART 5

### Proposed Instructional Changes Based on Conclusions Drawn from Evidence Presented Above

State any proposed instructional or assessment changes to be implemented for the next academic year. They should be based on conclusions reported in Part 4 (above) or on informal activities, such as faculty meetings and discussions, conferences, pilot projects, textbook adoption, new course proposals, curriculum modifications, etc. Explain the rationale for these changes and how they will impact student learning and other considerations, such as curriculum, degree plan, assessment process, or budget. If no changes are planned, simply state "No changes are planned."

| Student Learning Outcomes   | Instructional or Assessment Changes  | Rationale for Changes                            | Impact of Planned Changes on Student Learning and Other Considerations. |
|---|--|--|---|
| SLO 1 will stay the same.<br>SLO 2, 3, 4 may be replaced with a more general statement such as "students will demonstrate basic knowledge of accounting, economics and management." | Pretest/post-test data will not be used for SLO 2, 3, 4. It will be replaced with another instrument such as an exit exam. | Pre-test/post-test data are no longer available. | No changes on student learning since the curriculum is still the same.  |

## PART 6

### Shared Pedagogical Insight that Improves Student Learning or Classroom Engagement

(OPTIONAL) If your department or a faculty member has developed a method or technique of teaching that seems especially effective in improving student learning or student engagement in the classroom, please provide a brief description below. More detail can be communicated during the face to face peer review session.

| Description         |
|---------------------|
| No notable examples |



## PART 7 (A & B)

### Assessment Measures and Faculty Participation

#### A. Assessment Measures:

- 1) How many different assessment measures were used? 1
- 2) List the direct measures (see rubric): Standardized Final Exam,
- 3) List the indirect measures (see rubric): none

#### B.

- 1) Provide the names and signatures of all faculty members who contributed to this report and indicate their respective roles:

| Faculty Members  | Roles in the Assessment Process<br>(e.g., collect data, analyze data, prepare report,<br>review report, etc.) | Signatures        |
|------------------|---|-------------------|
| Roy Gardner      | Prepare report  | On separate sheet |
| Tetyana Kyrylova | Collect, analyze data for CS 1113   | On separate sheet |
| Thomas Luscomb   | Collect, analyze data for CS 1113   | On separate sheet |
| Peter Macpherson | Review report   | On separate sheet |
| Curtis Sparling  | Collect, analyze data for CS 1113   | On separate sheet |

- 2) Reviewed by:

| Titles          | Names        | Signatures        | Date       |
|-----------------|--------------|-------------------|------------|
| Department Head | Roy Gardner  | On separate sheet | 10/26/2015 |
| Dean            | Susan Willis | On separate sheet | 10/26/2015 |

## RUBRIC FOR STUDENT LEARNING STUDENT LEARNING REPORT

### 1) A. Are the school, department and program missions clearly stated?

| 4 = Exemplary  | 3 = Established  | 2 = Developing  | 1 = Undeveloped  |
|--|--|---|--|
| The program, department, and school missions are clearly stated. | The program, department, and school missions are stated, yet exhibit some deficiency (e.g., are partial or brief). | The program, department, and school missions are incomplete and exhibit some deficiency (e.g., are partial or brief). | The program, department, and school missions are not stated. |

### B. Are student learning outcomes and department purposes aligned with university commitments and school purposes?

| 4 = Exemplary  | 3 = Established   | 2 = Developing  | 1 = Undeveloped  |
|--|---|---|--|
| Student learning outcomes and department purposes are aligned with university commitments and school purposes. | Student learning outcomes and department purposes demonstrate some alignment with university commitments and school purposes. | Student learning outcomes and department purposes demonstrate limited alignment with university commitment and school purposes. | Student learning outcomes and department purposes do not demonstrate alignment with university commitment and school purposes. |

### 2) How well did the department incorporate instructional or assessment changes from last year's report or from other assessment activities?

| 4 = Exemplary   | 3 = Established   | 2 = Developing  | 1 = Undeveloped   |
|---|---|---|---|
| All planned changes were listed, whether they were implemented or not, and their impact on curriculum or program budget was discussed thoroughly. | Most planned changes were listed, and their status or impact on curriculum or program budget was discussed. | Some planned changes were listed, and their status or impact on curriculum or program budget was not clearly discussed. | No planned changes were listed, and their status or impact on curriculum or program budget was not discussed. |

### 3) Did the department include peer review feedback and provide rationale for implementing or not implementing suggestions?

| 4 = Exemplary                     | 3 = Established                    | 2 = Developing             | 1 = Undeveloped                 |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| All reviewer feedback was listed, | Most reviewer feedback was listed, | Some reviewer feedback was | Feedback from reviewers was not |

|   |  |  |           |
|---|--|--|-----------|
| and for each suggestion a clear rationale was given for its being implemented or not. | and for most suggestions a rationale was given for their being implemented or not. | listed, and for some suggestions a rationale was given for their being implemented or not. | included. |
|---|--|--|-----------|

**4) A. Are the student learning outcomes listed and measurable?**

| <b>4 = Exemplary</b>   | <b>3 = Established</b>  | <b>2 = Developing</b>   | <b>1 = Undeveloped</b>   |
|--|---|---|--|
| All student learning outcomes are listed and measurable in student behavioral action verbs (e.g., Bloom's Taxonomy). | Most student learning outcomes are listed and measurable in student behavioral action verbs (e.g., Bloom's Taxonomy). | Some student learning outcomes are listed and measurable in student behavioral action verbs (e.g., Bloom's Taxonomy). | Student learning outcomes are either not listed or not measurable. |

**B. Are the assessment measures appropriate for the student learning outcomes?**

| <b>4 = Exemplary</b>  | <b>3 = Established</b>   | <b>2 = Developing</b>  | <b>1 = Undeveloped</b>  |
|---|--|--|---|
| All assessment measures are appropriate to the student learning outcomes. | Most assessment measures are appropriate to the student learning outcomes. | Some assessment measures are appropriate to the student learning outcomes. | None of the assessment measures are appropriate to the student learning outcomes. |

**C. Do the performance standards provide a clearly defined threshold at an acceptable level of student performance?**

| <b>4 = Exemplary</b>   | <b>3 = Established</b>  | <b>2 = Developing</b>  | <b>1 = Undeveloped</b>  |
|--|---|--|---|
| All performance standards provide a clearly defined threshold at an acceptable level of student performance. | Most performance standards provide a clearly defined threshold at an acceptable level of student performance. | Some of the performance standards provide a clearly defined threshold at an acceptable level of student performance. | No performance standards provide a clearly defined threshold at an acceptable level of student performance. |

**D. Is the sampling method appropriate for all assessment measures?**

| <b>4 = Exemplary</b>   | <b>3 = Established</b>  | <b>2 = Developing</b>   | <b>1 = Undeveloped</b>   |
|--|---|---|--|
| The sampling methodology is appropriate for all assessment measures. | The sampling methodology is appropriate for most assessment measures. | The sampling methodology is appropriate for some assessment measures. | The sampling methodology is appropriate for none of the assessment measures. |

**E. Is the sample size listed for each assessment measure?**

| <b>4 = Exemplary</b> | <b>3 = Established</b> | <b>2 = Developing</b> | <b>1 = Undeveloped</b> |
|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|

|   |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|---|
| Sample size was listed for all assessment measures. | Sample size was listed for most assessment measures. | Sample size was listed for some assessment measures. | Sample size was not listed for any assessment measures. |
|---|--|--|---|

**F. How well do the data provide clear and meaningful overview of the results?**

| <b>4 = Exemplary</b>   | <b>3 = Established</b>  | <b>2 = Developing</b>   | <b>1 = Undeveloped</b>   |
|--|---|---|--|
| For all student learning outcomes the results were clear, more than a single year's results were included, and meaningful information was given that reveals an overview of student performance. | For most student learning outcomes the results were clear, more than a single year's results were included, and meaningful information was given that reveals an overview of student performance. | For some student learning outcomes the results were clear, more than a single year's results were included, and meaningful information was given that reveals an overview of student performance. | For none of the student learning outcomes the results were clear, more than a single year's results were included, and meaningful information was given that reveals an overview of student performance. |

**G. Are the conclusions reasonably drawn and significantly related to student learning outcomes?**

| <b>4 = Exemplary</b>  | <b>3 = Established</b>   | <b>2 = Developing</b>  | <b>1 = Undeveloped</b>  |
|---|--|--|---|
| All conclusions are reasonably drawn and significantly based on the results and related to the strengths and weaknesses in student performance. | Most conclusions are reasonably drawn and significantly based on the results and related to the strengths and weaknesses in student performance. | Some conclusions are reasonably drawn and significantly based on the results and related to the strengths and weaknesses in student performance. | No conclusions are reasonably drawn and significantly based on the results or related to the strengths and weaknesses in student performance. |

**H. Does the report indicate whether the performance standards were met?**

| <b>4 = Exemplary</b>                  | <b>3 = Established</b>                 | <b>2 = Developing</b>                  | <b>1 = Undeveloped</b>                   |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Stated for all performance standards. | Stated for most performance standards. | Stated for some performance standards. | Not stated for any performance standard. |

- 5) How well supported is the rationale for making assessment or instructional changes? The justification can be based on conclusions reported in Part 4 or on informal activities, such as faculty meetings and discussions, conferences, pilot projects, textbook adoption, new course proposals, curriculum modifications, etc. Explain the rationale for these changes and how they will impact student learning and other considerations, such as curriculum degree plan, assessment process, or budget.**

| <b>4 = Exemplary</b>    | <b>3 = Established</b>   | <b>2 = Developing</b>    | <b>1 = Undeveloped</b> |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| All planned changes are | Most planned changes are | Some planned changes are | No planned changes are |

|   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| specifically focused on student learning and based on the conclusions. The rationale for planned changes is well grounded and convincingly explained. | specifically focused on student learning and based on the conclusions. The rationale for planned changes is mostly well grounded and convincingly explained. | specifically focused on student learning and based on the conclusions. The rationale for planned changes is lacking or is not convincingly explained. | specifically focused on student learning and based on the conclusions. There is no rationale. |
|---|--|---|---|

**6) Did the faculty include at least one teaching technique they believe improves student learning or student engagement in the classroom?**

| Yes   | No   |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| The faculty has included at least one teaching technique they believe improves student learning or student engagement in the classroom. | The faculty has not included any teaching techniques they believe improve student learning or student engagement in the classroom. |  |  |

**7) A. How well did the faculty vary the assessment measures?**

| 4 = Exemplary  | 3 = Established  | 2 = Developing  | 1 = Undeveloped   |
|--|--|---|---|
| Assessment measures vary and include multiple direct measures and at least one indirect measure. The number of measures is consistent with those listed. | Assessment measures vary, but they are all direct. The number of measures is consistent with those listed. | Assessment measures do not vary or are all indirect. There is some inconsistency in the number of measures recorded and the total listed. | Assessment measures are not all listed or are listed in the wrong category. The total number of measures is not consistent with those listed. |

**B. Does the list of faculty participants clearly describe their role in the assessment process?**

| 4 = Exemplary   | 3 = Established   | 2 = Developing  | 1 = Undeveloped   |
|---|---|---|---|
| The faculty role is clearly identified and it is apparent that the majority of the faculty participated in the process. The roles are varied. | The faculty role is identified and it is apparent that the majority of the faculty participated in the process. The roles are not varied. | The faculty roles are not identified. Few faculty participated. | The faculty roles are not identified. Faculty participation is not sufficiently described to make a determination about who participated. |

## EXPLANATION & EXAMPLES OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT EVIDENCE

**DIRECT EVIDENCE of student learning is tangible, visible, self-explanatory evidence of exactly what students have and haven't learned. Examples include:**

- 1) Ratings of student skills by their field experience supervisors.
- 2) Scores and pass rates on licensure/certification exams or other published tests (e.g. Major Field Tests) that assess key learning outcomes.
- 3) Capstone experiences such as research projects, presentations, oral defenses, exhibitions, or performances that are scored using a rubric.
- 4) Written work or performances scored using a rubric.
- 5) Portfolios of student work.
- 6) Scores on locally-designed tests such as final examinations in key courses, qualifying examinations, and comprehensive examinations that are accompanied by test blueprints describing what the tests assess.
- 7) Score gains between entry and exit on published or local tests or writing samples.
- 8) Employer ratings of the skills of recent graduates.
- 9) Summaries and analyses of electronic class discussion threads.
- 10) Student reflections on their values, attitudes, and beliefs, if developing those are intended outcomes of the program.

**INDIRECT EVIDENCE provides signs that students are probably learning, but the evidence of exactly what they are learning is less clear and less convincing. Examples include:**

- 1) Course grades.
- 2) Assignment grades, if not accompanied by a rubric or scoring guide.
- 3) For four year programs, admission rates into graduate programs and graduation rates from those programs.
- 4) For two year programs, admission rates into four-year institutions and graduation rates from those programs.
- 5) Placement rates of graduates into appropriate career positions and starting salaries.
- 6) Alumni perceptions of their career responsibilities and satisfaction.
- 7) Student ratings of their knowledge and skills and reflections on what they have learning over the course of the program.
- 8) Those questions on end-of-course student evaluations forms that ask about the course rather than the instructor.
- 9) Student/alumni satisfaction with their learning, collected through surveys, exit interviews, or focus groups
- 10) Honors, awards, and scholarships earned by students and alumni.

Suskie, L. (2004). *Assessing Student Learning: A Common Sense Guide*. Anker Publishing Company: Bolton, MA